

BULLITT HIT THE SPOT

All the Silk-Hat Brigade Looking for a Little Hole to Crawl Into.

Great buckets of blood!
Adam choked on an apple-core!
And Moses having a tooth pulled!
If I ain't run ker slap-dab into a fine mess of testimony now, I just want you to hush, as Tom Watts says.
Wait a minute.
Let's start at the starting place and keep it all straight as we go along.
Ready?
All right.

Away back last winter when the peace conference at Paris was just beginning to warm up and was able to shake one leg a little, the main question was what to do with Russia. Bolshevism was in the saddle and didn't show any disposition to get down. And all them brave parlor soldiers at the peace conference were just about plum scared out of their britches, as Shakespeare says.

Well, there was a newspaper guy by the name of William C. Bullitt hanging around there with nothing much to do, and Mister Secretary Lansing suggested to Mister President Wilson that they send Mister Quill-Driver Bullitt to Petrograd, Russia, to talk matters over with Mister Bolshevik Lenine and find out what he was trying to do, anyhow, and what terms he would compromise on.

Well, Mr. Bullitt very obediently ambled off to Petrograd on his appointed mission, and in due time returned to Paris.

Did he have any report to make?

Yes, boy.
Did he make it?
He certainly did.
Was that report given out to the world?

It certainly was NOT.
A silence so heavy that it would have taken forty locomotives to move it fell over that report, and that was the last anybody heard of it.

The curtain was down for shore-certain.

But, oh, boy!
Just looky!
Up goes the curtain at Washington, D. C., on Sept. 12.

Our same William C. Bullitt is before the Senate Foreign Relations committee as a witness. Lodge is trying to use Bullitt to shoot some more holes in Wilson's rubber doll, the league of nations.

The whole story of what Bullitt told that committee makes mighty interesting reading, but the fun begins when he starts in to tell about that trip to Russia. It's a thousand wonders the Ass-ociated Press would have told it, but it did. Here is the juicy bite:

"A wealth of information, regarded as more or less confidential, was given by the witness during his three-hour statement. In February last, he said, he was sent by Secretary Lansing to Petrograd to bring back from the Soviet leaders a statement showing the exact terms on which they would agree to peace. This report, which told among other things of good order established by the Bolsheviks, Lenine's desire for peace, his readiness to

compromise at many points in order to obtain it, and his promise that all foreign debts of the Soviet government would be paid, was never made public, Bullitt said, because the President would not agree."

Stop and let that soak in. The President would not agree for Bullitt's report on the Bolshevik situation to be made public.

Why?
Simply because it was not as unfavorable to the Bolshevik government as Wilson and company wanted it to be.

If Bullitt had come back and said that Lenine had horns four feet long and could swaller young babies as fast as they could be fed to him on a pitchfork, that report would have been on the wires before you could say scat. If he had told that Trotsky had forked cast-iron hoofs and a steel tail with barbs on it and eyes that looked like two red-hot skillet-lids, that report would have been all over the world in about the tenth part of nine seconds. If he had told that there was nobody left alive in Russia except the Bolshevik army and three old witches, and that they lived entirely on dried human flesh, there ain't steel vaults enough in Paris to have kept that report locked up.

But because Bullitt's report showed that the Bolshevik leaders were not very different from other men, that they had succeeded in establishing good order, and that they were willing to pay their debts and compromise and make peace—why, great howling tom-cats!—it would never do to send out a report like that.

Well?
And then what?

Can't you see through it?
The Bullitt report didn't tally with the big scary tales about Russia that the Allies had been circulating, and so they either had to suppress the report or acknowledge to the world that they had misrepresented Russia.

And now Wilson, Lansing, and all the rest of the high-mucks are trying to wiggle out from under the responsibility of sending Bullitt to Russia. They are trying to pretend that he just sorter went on his own hook, and that he ain't got more than half sense, nohow.

But they can't put that across. They sent him.

And they don't dare to deny that the report he brought back was a true report.

But it got the same treatment that the truth generally gets—it was suppressed.

But, thanks to the Lodge committee, it is now out good and plenty, and I notice that none of them have dared to say it is a lie.

Bullitt has got the whole silk-hatted gang looking for a hole to crawl into, and there ain't nary hole little enough.

I don't give three whoops whether you believe what I say or not. If you don't, somebody else will. Anyhow, I'm gonna talk.

Ed Howe, in the August number of his "Monthly," rises to inquire: "Will government finally become so bad everywhere that anarchy will become the only way out?" I'm afraid that's about the size of it, Uncle Ed. It don't miss it much right now.

A VERY CIVIL ANSWER

But a Long Keen Good 'Un, Just the Same.

Glennville, Ga.,
Aug. 12th, 1919.

Mr. James Larkin Pearson,
Boomer, N. C.
Dear Brother:

I am perfectly honest in all that I preach, but I know that one may be honest and yet be mistaken. I believe that the body is one thing, and that the soul, or spirit, is another. I base my belief on the following scriptures:

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."—Ecl. 12:7.

"Fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."—Matt. 10:28.

What is your interpretation of these scriptures?

I believe that the soul, or spirit, lives after the body is dead. I base this belief on the following scriptures:

"And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Matt. 10:28.

"For I am in a straight betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better," (Christ was in heaven, but Paul knew that if he departed his body would become dust. It was his soul or spirit that would be with Christ); "nevertheless, to abide in the flesh (to have the soul remain in the body, and thus for the body to live) is more needful for you."—Phil. 1:23-24.

If my interpretation of these scriptures is not correct, what is the correct interpretation?

Moses died and was buried considerably more than a thousand years before Jesus was born; yet he was with Jesus at the Transfiguration. How do you explain this? If you say that Moses' body had been resurrected, where is your proof? If it was not his resurrected body, how do you escape the conclusion that it was his disembodied spirit, which could be made visible, and was conscious, and could talk?

I am in earnest and want to know the truth. It is too serious a matter to joke about, and I shall be very much disappointed if you give me an uncivil answer. Please don't ridicule me for being orthodox. Teach me, if I am wrong. I like your Millennial teaching.

Very truly,
W. B. SCREWS.

Reply.

Now that is a sensible and reasonable letter. There is some satisfaction in trying to talk and reason with a man like that. If I can make him see the point he will acknowledge it. He may be sorter hard to convince, but when once convinced he will be a wheel-hoss for the truth.

So here we go.

Your first mistake, Mr. Screws is in supposing that the soul and the spirit are one and the same. You cannot find any Bible authority for using the words interchangeably as you have used them. The spirit and the body are two different things, and there is no soul about either of them. But when these two things are COMBINED they produce the soul.

Now to your first reference: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."—Ecl. 12:7.

Who is that talking about?

The dead, you say.

Yes, but what sort of dead? Does it mean the righteous dead, or the wicked dead? Or does it mean both? I think you will have to agree with me that it means either or both. It is talking about a dead man regardless of whether he was good or bad, and it conveys the

idea that in EVERY case of death the spirit returns to God who gave it.

That makes the spirits of the WICKED dead go to God, too, don't it? Then what becomes of the old orthodox teaching that the spirits of the WICKED dead go to HELL at death? If ALL the spirits return to God at death, then it is a clear case that none of them go to the devil at death.

But wait a minute.

Are we to understand, then, that the spirits of the wicked dead go to heaven and enjoy bliss and happiness there along with the spirits of the righteous. Surely not.

Then how are you going to fix it?

There is no distinction made between the good spirits and the bad spirits in the verse you quote. They simply all return to God alike.

So if the wicked spirits that go to God are not enjoying a conscious life of bliss, evidently the righteous are not, either. If there was so much difference in condition between the two classes of spirits that return to God, surely there would have been something said about it.

In order to make it fit the modern orthodox teaching, that verse should read this way:

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and if the man is a good man his spirit shall go to God, but if he is a bad man his spirit shall go to the devil."

But you see it don't read that way.

It don't say a word about any of the spirits going to the devil.

The plain inference is that they all go to God just alike. The spirit is just the "breath of life."

After God made Adam's body out of the dust of the ground. He did not add anything at all to it except the "breath of life." See Genesis 2:7.

Now that "breath of life" that God breathed into Adam was just the common air that we all breathe. But the process of breathing common air started up life and consciousness in Adam and he BECAME A LIVING SOUL.

There were just two things to start with—a lifeless body and the "breath of life."

Nothing else was added.

But the combination of those two things made a "living soul."

You notice that the spirit "returns to God who gave it."

Then the spirit must be something that God GAVE to Adam. What did God GIVE to Adam except his body of dust?

Nothing at all except the breath of life.

I challenge the world to produce a syllable of Bible evidence that God added anything else to Adam except those two things.

There we have absolute proof that the spirit COULDN'T be anything else except the breath of life.

Now as long as the breath of life is in a man it belongs to him, and it keeps him alive.

But when the breath of life leaves a man's body, where does that breath of life go?

Does it pack up all the man's conscious mental faculties and emotions in a little invisible suitcase and go lugging them off to heaven?

It certainly does not.

It simply goes out into the common atmosphere. All the air belongs to God. It is all a part of His infinite estate, so to speak. And that is the sense in which it goes back to Him.

Now to your next quotation in Matthew 10:28. You have mixed up that verse by putting the last part of it first. But I can handle it either way. The correct reading, however, is this:

"And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

The meaning here is that men can take your present life and kill

your body, which of course puts your soul out of business at the same time. And if you were to never again have bodily life your soul would never again have conscious existence. But back of your present life stands the fact that God intends for you to live again, and men cannot destroy that fact. The hope of the resurrection bridges over the stream of death and makes it proper to say that the conscious entity which we speak of as the soul, although for the time being rendered unconscious, is not finally destroyed. But if you could set aside the hope of the resurrection, then when a man killed your body he would have finally and utterly killed the whole thing. That would be the last of you.

The verse under consideration says that God is able to DESTROY both soul and body. But remember this—if the soul were immortal, God Himself could not destroy it. You can't twist the word DESTROY into meaning eternal torment in hell. When a thing is DESTROYED it does not exist, and as long as a soul exists in torment that soul has not been DESTROYED.

The manner in which God can and will destroy both soul and body is this: When a sinner goes into the SECOND DEATH (from which there is to be no resurrection) then his whole being is utterly gone forever. That will indeed be utter extinction of being.

The FIRST DEATH certainly WOULD be utter extinction of being except for the hope of the resurrection. But that hope bridges the chasm and makes us look upon the first death as a SLEEP from which there is to be an awakening. But, mark you this, when people are ASLEEP they do not know anything.

Now as to Paul's "desire to depart and be with Christ."

If we didn't have any more of Paul's words to compare with this, there might be a chance to make it mean what you think it means. There is no denying that the language in that particular place lends itself very easily to that interpretation. But when you examine the words carefully and without any preconceived notions, they do not necessarily mean that at all. Poor old Paul had a pretty tough time of it in his earthly life. He was constantly being persecuted by powerful enemies, and he suffered for the truth's sake about as much as any man could suffer. And of course it was humanly natural for him to sometimes wish that his troubles were at an end. He had a DESIRE to depart and be with Christ, but there is not a word to indicate that he EXPECTED to be with Christ as soon as he died. He just wished that the life of trouble and the sleep of death were all over and that the time had come for him to be with Christ in the Kingdom of peace and happiness which is yet to be set up on the earth. He was looking forward to that happy time with longing anticipation, just as every true Christian does today. But for the sake of his friends whom he might bless and comfort by living among them, he was willing to wait and face the struggle of life awhile longer.

Various other places in Paul's writings show that he had no expectations of going to heaven when he died. We must not jump at conclusions from reading just one little paragraph. We should read and study all of Paul's writing and see whether the rest of it bears out the thought of going to heaven at death. And we will find that it does not. Right here in this same epistle to the Philippians (chapter 3, verse 20) he says:

"For our citizenship is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ." There you see Paul was not thinking about going to heaven to be with Christ, but he

was looking for Christ to come FROM heaven back to the earth.

In 1st Corinthians 1:7 he speaks of "WAITING for the coming of our Lord." How could Paul go to Christ in heaven and at the same time wait for Him to come? Writing to the Colossian church, he says: "When Christ our life shall appear, THEN shall we also appear with him in glory." Which seems to be very plain evidence that Paul didn't expect to be with Christ in glory BEFORE that time. In 1st Thessalonians 1:10 Paul uses these words: "And to WAIT for His Son from heaven." Instead of telling the Thessalonian saints to go to Christ in heaven, he told them to WAIT here on earth and Christ would come back to them. In 1st Thessalonians 4:16-17 he tells how the dead in Christ shall rise and be "caught up to MEET the Lord in the air." Now if those dead people have already been with Christ ever since they died, what is the sense in saying they will MEET him?

How much more evidence would it take to convince you that Paul never expected to go to heaven at death?

And now a few words about your last point.

You say that Moses, although he had died more than a thousand years before, was with Christ at the Transfiguration. Why, my dear sir, you have evidently read the scriptures very carelessly or you would know better than that. The truth is that Moses was not there at all. Neither the body, soul, spirit nor any other part of Moses was present there on that occasion,

and it surprises me that a man of your sense would make such a slip as that. Is it possible that you have never read Matthew 17:9, in which Jesus pointedly told his disciples as they came down from the mount that they had seen a VISION? You certainly know that a VISION of a thing is NEVER the real thing. That was just a little fore-gleam of the Kingdom of Christ as it will be in the future, and it was not real at that time at all. We have the plain statement from the lips of Jesus himself that it was only a vision.

What about the vision that John the Revelator had on the Isle of Patmos, when he saw all the wonderful things that are recorded in the book of Revelation? Do you contend that all those things were actually there before John's eyes in a LITERAL sense? You have just as much right to claim that all the things recorded in Revelation were LITERAL HAPPENINGS as you have to claim that the APPEARANCE of Moses at the Transfiguration was literal.

I could go on for a solid week along this line, but I just must leave a little room in the paper for something else.

Come again, brother.

AW, YOUR BIG TOE!

"My fellow citizens, I am going to devote every influence I have and all the authority I have from this time on to see to it that no minority commands the United States."—Woodrow Wilson in his speech at Seattle.

And, yet at that very minute he was wanting the Democratic minority in the Senate to bulldoze the Republican majority into accepting his League program. And he was wanting a few thousand capitalists to have more voice in the labor dispute than many millions of workers. And he was wanting to give fifteen million Roman Catholics in this country more power in the government than ninety million protestants.

Don't that look a plum sight like Wilson was in favor of majority rule?

Now jist don't it?